Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action of October 27, 2004. Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 1-26** is respectfully requested. Please note that claims 1, 5, 15, 23, and 24 have been canceled.

Summary of The Office Action

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 14, 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 22, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schneider et al. (5,832,452).

Claims 1-21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider et al. (5,832,452).

Drawings

Applicant inquires whether the formal drawings filed with the application are approved. The present office action does not indicate their status.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 has been canceled. Independent claim 13 has been amended to recite a computer-implemented method. Independent claim 18 has been amended to recite a computer readable medium for providing computer executable instructions for performing a method. A computer readable medium is supported, for example, at the bottom of page 11 of the present application. Thus, no new matter has been added. The

claims require technology from the computer arts and the recited features are not performed manually. Thus, all claims are statutory subject matter and the § 101 rejection should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 14, 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 14 and 26 have been amended to clarify the language and to correct the objections raised by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection

Claims 22 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schneider et al. (5,832,452). Claim 24 has been canceled. Independent claim 22 has been amended to recite that in response to identifying the at least one lodging facility, the processor being configured to execute instructions for making a reservation in the at least one lodging facility for a user; and the processor being further configured to generate a report indicating the reservations resulting from users who requested to locate a lodging facility offering selected printing services.

Schneider fails to teach or suggest a processor configured to make reservations at a lodging facility in response to locating a facility based on selected printing service criteria. Schneider also fails to teach or suggest a processor configured to generate a report of reservations that were a result of a search for printing services. Therefore, independent claim 22 and dependent claims 25-26 patentably distinguishes over Schneider.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

Claims 1-21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider et al. (5,832,452). Claims 1, 5, 15, and 23 have been canceled. Claims 2-4, and 6-12 are now dependent from claim 18. Claims 13 and 18 are in independent form.

Independent Claim 13

Independent claim 13 has been amended to recite a computer-implemented method that in response to a software application attempting to perform a printing operation using a print driver based on selected printing requirements, initiating a request to locate a remote facility that provides hardware/software for performing the printing operation. The amendments are supported by, for example, page 5 of the present application. Thus, no new matter has been added.

One example use of the method of claim 13 can be when a user tries to print a document from their computer by selecting a print operation from a menu (e.g. selecting File→Print). If the print application (e.g. print driver) determines that a printer is not available, a search request can be initiated and sent to a server to locate a nearby facility that provides printing services. In this manner, an available public printer can be located for a traveling user who does not have an attached printer.

Schneider fails to teach or suggest a method that initiates a request to locate a facility that provides printing services in response to performing a print operation as recited in claim 13. Schneider teaches a system that searches for hotels when a user is specifically searching for a hotel. The search is not part of or initiated in response to a printing operation.

Since claim 13 recites features not taught or suggested by Schneider, claim 13 patentably distinguishes over Schneider. Accordingly, dependent claims 14, 16, and 17 also patentably distinguish over the references and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 18

Independent 18 has been amended to recite a computer readable medium for performing a method. The method comprises initiating a print operation to print a selected item based on selected print requirements using a print driver, and as part of the print operation, transmitting a search request to a server to locate a facility having a printing service capable of performing the print operation.

As previously explained, Schneider teaches a system that searches for hotels when a user is specifically searching for a hotel. The search is not part of or initiated in response to a printing operation. Therefore, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Schneider. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-4, 6-12, and 19-21 also patentably distinguish over the references and are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 2-4, 6-14, 16-22, and 25-26** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

21-JAN-2005

PETAR KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)
(216) 348-5843